



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/824,117	04/02/2001	David W. Boyd	10003824-1	9177

7590

01/24/2006

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
----------

AL HASHEMI, SANA A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2164

DATE MAILED: 01/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/824,117		BOYD ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Sana Al-Hashemi		2164	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 December 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 33-45 and 53-63 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 33-45, 53-63 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is issued in response to applicant's amendment filed 12/19/05.
2. Claims 33-45, and 53-63 are pending. Claims 1-32, and 46-52 are canceled.
3. Applicant's arguments filed 12/19/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 33-45, and 53-63 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Regarding Claims 33-45 the claimed subject matter in "using camera to capture at least one image, and using said camera to capture information associated with said image, wherein said information is stored in a database". No support found in the specification for this amendment.

Art Unit: 2164

Claim 33, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter “physical label” which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 33-39, 40-45, 53-55, and 60-63, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slater et al. (Slater hereinafter) (US Patent 6,483,570) in view of Parulski et al (Parulski hereinafter) (US Patent No. 6,629,104).

Regarding Claims 33, 59, Slater discloses a method comprising:

using camera to capture at least one image; (see Col 5, lines 52-55, Slater), Slater is silent regarding the use of a digital camera, although, no images can be captured or processed without the use of a camera and to expedite the prosecution the Examiner presents a secondary reference Parulski discloses the use of a camera to capture images (Fig. 2, 10, Col. 3, lines 39-45). It would

Art Unit: 2164

have been obvious to use the camera to capture photos since it's the only way images can be captured.

capture information associated with said image, wherein said information is stored in a database; and (see Col. 2, lines 55-63, Parulski); and

using said information to generate a physical label having an identifier, wherein the label is adapted to be affixed to a storage device that is adapted to hold printed copies of the plurality of images (see column 6, lines 1-8, Slater, Col. 3, lines 14-26, Parulski).

Regarding Claim 34, Slater in view of Parulski discloses a method wherein said image is a digital image further comprising:

storing each image of the plurality of images in said database (see column 7, lines 30-37, Slater);

Regarding Claims 35, and 44, Slater in view of Parulski discloses a method wherein capturing said information comprises:

forming metadata during formation of said image(see column 7, lines 51-54, Slater).

Regarding Claim 36, Slater in view of Parulski discloses a method wherein capturing said information comprises:

accepting said information from a user (see column10, lines 19-27, Slater).

Regarding Claims 37, and 43, Slater in view of Parulski discloses a method wherein the information is at least one of:

GPS coordinates;

a time;

a date;

Art Unit: 2164

camera information;

an audio file;

at least one keyword;

a description of subject matter of the image (see column 15, lines 1-6, Slater); and

an event associated with the image (see column 6, lines 1-10, Slater).

Regarding Claims 38, Slater in view of Parulski discloses a method wherein the storage device is selected from the group consisting of:

an envelope (see column 7, lines 60-65, Slater);

an album; and

a box.

Regarding Claim 40, Slater in view of Parulski discloses a method further comprising:

forming at least a portion of the plurality of images by a non-digital camera (see column 10, lines 32-39, Slater); and

converting the at least a portion of the plurality of images into digital form (see column 10, lines 2-10, Slater).

Regarding Claim 41, Slater in view of Parulski discloses a method further comprising:

placing the label on the storage device (see column 7, lines 60-65, Slater); and

placing printed copies of the plurality of images in the storage device (see Fig. 7, Slater).

Regarding Claim 42, Slater in view of Parulski discloses a method further comprising:

searching the database with a query to locate a printed copy of one image of the plurality of images (see column 6, lines 31-43, Slater);

Art Unit: 2164

providing the identifier associated with the one image (see column 6, lines 44-47m Slater) ;

locating the storage container with the label having the identifier (see column 6, lines 45-49, Slater);

searching the storage container for the printed copy of the one image (see column 7, lines 30-35, Salter).

Regarding Claim 45, Slater in view of Parulski discloses a method further comprising:  
searching the database with a query to locate the printed copy of the image (see column 6, lines 31-43, Slater); and

providing the thumbnail representation of the image (see column 10, lines 19-27, Slater).

Regarding Claim 53, Slater in view of Parulski discloses a method comprising:  
generating information identifying an image at a time said image is captured (Col. 2, lines 28-38, Parulski);

automatically producing meta-data associated with said image (Col. 3, lines 9-13, Parulski);

providing the meta-data into a database (Col. 3, lines 5-8, Parulski);

generating a label that is adapted to be affixed to a storage device adapted to hold a printed copy of said image, wherein said label has an identifier generated from said identifying information (see column 6, lines 1-8, Slater, Col. 3, lines 14-26, Parulski); and

providing said identifier into said database (Col. 6, lines 9-21, Parulski).

Regarding Claims 54, Slater in view of Parulski discloses a method wherein said identifying

Art Unit: 2164

information is automatically generated by a device capturing said image (see column 14, lines 6-8, Slater);.

Regarding Claims 55, Slater in view of Parulski discloses a method further comprising: providing a thumbnail representation of the image into the database(see column 11, lines 20-30, Slater); and

printing the thumbnail representation on the label (see column 11, lines 30-46, Slater).

Regarding Claim 56, Slater in view of Parulski discloses a method wherein the meta-data includes global position system (GPS) coordinates acquired at a time when the image is produced.

Regarding Claim 60, Slater in view of Parulski discloses a method further comprising: generating a thumbnail of said image on said label (see column 11, lines 20-30, Slater).

Regarding Claim 61, Slater in view of Parulski discloses method further comprising: organizing said images on said computer using said meta-data (Col 5, lines 43-54, Parulski).

Regarding Claim 62, Slater in view of Parulski discloses a method further comprising: automatically creating, with said computer, said identifier (col. 6, lines 1-8, Parulski).

Regarding Claim 63, Slater in view of Parulski discloses a method further comprising: storing, in said computer, said meta-data, said user data, and said identifier (col. 6, lines 1-8, Parulski).

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:



Art Unit: 2164

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 39, 56-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slater et al. (US Patent 6,483,570) in view of Parulski et al (Parulski hereinafter) (US Patent No. 6,629,104) and further in view of Reed (US Patent No. 6,426,801).

Regarding Claim 39, the combination of Slater in view of Parulski discloses all of the claimed subject matter as set forth above. However, the combination of Slater in view of Parulski is silent with regard to the method of forming at least a portion of the plurality of images by a digital camera. However, Reed on the other hand discloses the use of formatting at least a portion of the plurality of images by a digital camera (see column 6, lines 26-32, Reed). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to develop films from digital camera as suggested by Reed, with the motivation of increasing the market share and make it accessible for higher verity of customers, which in other words increase the company's revenue.

Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slater et al. (US Patent 6,483,570) in view of Parulski et al (Parulski hereinafter) (US Patent No. 6,629,104) and further in view of Kinjo (US Patent No. 6,813,395).

Regarding Claim 56, the combination of Slater in view of Parulski discloses all of the claimed subject matter set forth above. However, Slater does not disclose the use of the GPS to coordinates acquired at a time when the image is produced. On the other hand, Kinjo discloses the use of the GPS coordinating at the time the image is produced. It would have been obvious to

Art Unit: 2164

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the GPS in coordinating the time of the image is to provide the user with higher and more specific details as taught by Kinjo column 23, lines 1-54.

Regarding Claim 57, Slater in view of Kinjo discloses a method further comprising:

searching for the image in the database by submitting a query to the database, wherein the query includes criteria associated with at least one of the meta-data and the user data (see column 24, lines 32-42, Kinjo).

Regarding Claim 58, Slater in view of Kinjo discloses a method further comprising:

displaying a thumbnail representation of the image upon matching the query to the image in the database (see column 17, lines 48-57, Slater).

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant traverse the 112 rejection with the support is provided in the specification for the claimed subject matter.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. The portion disclosed by the applicant does not provide support to the claimed subject matter, "In step 103, meta-data (if the photograph was taken by a camera capable of producing meta-data) is associated with the provided photograph. Meta-data refers to data that is automatically produced when a photograph is taken. For example, meta-data would include the GPS coordinates if the photograph was taken by a GPS receiver-enabled digital camera. Also, many digital cameras associate time and date information with each photograph. Time and date meta-data may be associated with the photograph for retrieval

Art Unit: 2164

purposes. Other meta-data may be associated with the photograph such as a voice annotation. The meta-data may identify the type of camera utilized. For example, the meta-data may identify the model number of the digital camera. The preceding examples are merely exemplary. Any type of auto-generated meta-data may be associated with the photograph depending upon the capability of a given camera.” The cited portion teaches the producing of meta-data, and disclosed meta-data has nothing to do with capturing information associated with said image, wherein said information is stored in a database. No how the user captures that information if the information is stored in a database? The specification does not provide support to the claimed subject matter, and with respect to the newly amended limitation “physical label” the specification has no support for that subject matter and it has been rejected under 112 1<sup>st</sup> as a new matter. The 112 rejection is maintained and finalized.

Applicant argues that the references fail to disclose “the automatic capture of information via a camera or printing labels to affix to a storage device for storing images”.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. The step of capturing information via a camera has been rejected under 112 because it’s not supported in the specification and the step of printing labels to affix to a storage device for storing images is not claimed subject matter in the claim language. However, the combination of Slater in view of Parulski discloses at (Col. 3, lines 14-28, and 42-46, respectively, Parulski), the step of using a meta-data from the camera and the method of storing images and printing images.

Applicant argues with respect to claim 39, that Reed in combination of Slater in view of Parulski and further in view of Reed does not disclose the “said camera to capture information associated with said image, wherein said information is stored in a database”.

Art Unit: 2164

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Beside the argued subject matter has been rejected under 112 for lack of support in the specification. Applicant cannot show non-obviousness by attacking the references individually where, as the rejections are based on combination of references. In re Keller, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

Applicant argues with respect to the dependent claim 58, the prior art fails to disclose “meat-data including global position system GPS coordinates acquired at a time when the image is produced”.

Examiner disagrees. Refereeing to the combination of Slater in view of Kinjo discloses the step of meat-data including a GPS at Col. 23, lines 35-42 Kinjo discloses the argued limitation.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2164

***Points of Contact***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sana Al-Hashemi whose telephone number is 571-272-4013.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8Am-4:30Pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on 571-272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



**CHARLES RONES  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**

Sana Al-Hashemi  
Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 2100  
January 19, 2006